# TOWN OF GILBERT PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION GILBERT MUNICIPAL CENTER, 50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE GILBERT ARIZONA MAY 7, 2014

### COMMISSION PRESENT:

Chairman Jennifer Wittmann
Vice Chairman Joshua Oehler
Commissioner Brigette Peterson
Commissioner David Blaser
Commissioner Carl Bloomfield
Commissioner Kristofer Sippel
Commissioner David Cavenee
Alternate Commissioner Khyl Powell

### **COMMISSION ABSENT:**

None

**STAFF PRESENT:** 

Planning Services Manager Linda Edwards Principal Planner Catherine Lorbeer

Senior Planner Maria Cadavid

Planner Amy Temes Planner Curtis Neal Planner Nathan Williams

ALSO PRESENT:

Town Attorney Michael Hamblin Town Attorney Jack Vincent Recorder Margo Fry

# **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Jennifer Wittmann called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

GP14-06 - Parcels 10 & 17 of Cooley Station: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classifications of approximately 115 acres of real property generally located at the southeast of the southeast corner of Recker and Williams Field Roads from 8.47 acres of Residential >8-14 Du/Acres, and 106.27 acres of Residential > 5-8 Du/Acre land use classifications to 112.74 acres of Residential 3.5 - 5 DU/Acre land use classification and 2.04 acres of Neighborhood Commercial (NC);

Z14-11 - Parcels 10 & 17 of Cooley Station: Request to amend Ordinance[s] No.1900, 2179, 2195, 2304, 2413, 2425, 2443, 2473 and 2485 and rezone approximately 115 acres of real property within the Cooley Station Planned Area Development (PAD) and generally located Recker and Williams Field Roads from approximately 115 acres of Single Family - Detached (SF-D) within a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district to approximately 112.7 acres of Single Family - Detached (SF-D) and 2.04 acres of Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning districts.

S14-05 - Parcels 10 & 17 Of Cooley Station: Request To Approve The Preliminary Plat For Parcels 10 & 17 Of Cooley Station, A 416 Lot Single Family Home Subdivision On Approximately 112.7

Planning Commission Study Session 5-7-14 Acres Of Real Property Located Southeast Of The Southeast Corner Of Recker And Williams Field Roads Zoned Pending Approval Single Family – Detached (Sf-D) Zoning District With A Planned Area Development (Pad) Overlay.

Planner Amy Temes stated that this was a request in Cooley Station asking for the General Plan Amendment to change approximately  $8\frac{1}{2}$  acres from 8-14 dwelling units per acre and approximately 106 acres from 5-8 dwelling units per acre to 112 acres of 3.5-5 dwelling units per acre and 2 acres of Neighborhood Commercial (NC). The zoning will change to SF-D with modifications. An aerial map was displayed and the location of the previously approved charter school was pointed out. The site goes up the collector road that leads to the Cooley village core and connects into the loop area. The General Plan map was displayed and the subject two acres was pointed out at the far west side of the property that is requesting Neighborhood Commercial with the rest being Residential 3.5-5. This is primarily for the majority of the acreage, one step down in General Plan land use category. In terms of the zoning, it is still SF-D and NC.

Chairman Wittmann said that it does not look as though the plat was advertised on the agenda but it is in the packet.

Planner Temes said that a version of the plat was also the development plan so the lot layout is identical. It is a zoning exhibit.

Planning manager Edwards asked staff to refer to the exhibit as a development plan so that it would not confuse others.

Planner Temes indicated the development plan and noted that the discussion that they had with the applicant was that this was Cooley Station and the guidelines that were provided for Cooley Station are neotraditional in their design guidelines. Neotraditional from a single family lot residential neighborhood standpoint has a combination of lot sizes and products with a lot of open space and a lot of amenity gathering places for the neighbors. There are not a lot of garages up and down the street. You see porches, patios and other types of entry features but not wall after wall of garage doors. It is laid out so that no matter what street you go down, the garages are on only one side of the street. There are alley loaded products, front loaded products, side on garages with parking on the street and garages that access one side of the street. When the product is alley loaded you actually still have a driveway and the driveway is off the alley. There is still a place to park the car in the driveway but it happens to be off the alley and not off of the primary street. This type of product has not been seen before in Gilbert and it is very exciting to have a true neotraditional neighborhood come forward. It is within walking distance to a school and to the village core. The developer wanted Cooley station to be a true mix of zoning categories and a cradle to grave community so that as you progress through life, whatever you desire at different stages in life, that product is available in Cooley Station. Planner Temes referred to the following graph on page 5 of the staff report:

Site Development	LDC SF - D		Proposed SF – D PAD	
Minimum Lot Size	3,000	6,000	7,680	9,450
Minimum Lot Dimensions	N/A	50 ft x 120 ft	60' x 128'	70' x 135'
Min Front Yard Setback	10 ft	10 ft	12 ft	15 ft
Minimum Side Yard Setback	0 ft or 5 ft	5' and 5'	5' and 10'	5' and 10'
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	10 ft	5 ft	20 ft	25 ft
Maximum Height	36 ft / 3 story	30 ft / 2 story	30 ft / 2 story	30 ft / 2 story
Maximum Lot Coverage	60% - 1 story	60% - 1 story	60% - 1 story	60% - 1 story
	50% - 2 story	50% - 2 story	50% - 2 story	50% - 2 story

The developer is not looking to close up the open space and it still allows for accessory structures to be built in the rear yards. Regarding the Neighborhood Commercial parcel, at this point in time the school would like to purchase that NC parcel. Schools are not allowed within SF – D zoning and so that is one of the reasons that the school came forward previously to rezone the rest of this parcel to Public Facility

institutional (PF/I). Because the school has not actually purchased the property yet, the Cooley's, who own the land, were concerned about zoning PF/I because that can be very limiting to them if they end up having to sell to someone else. Neighborhood Commercial is a category for commercial use that is designed to interact with neighborhoods. It has a limit of one stories, it has setbacks that would buffer residential and is supposed to be uses that are complementary to neighborhoods. Some of the uses that would be allowed would be; animal grooming, food preparation, funeral and undertaking, government offices, healthcare, general offices, personal services, churches, public facilities, entertainment/recreation small-scale, eating and drinking with a use permit. Some other uses are retail uses with a use permit, seasonal sales, teen nightclubs with a use permit, and car washes with a use permit. Uses that could be questionable for neighborhood with noise and lights etc. would be things that would require a use permit. The setbacks for neighborhood commercial is 20' front, 15' side to residential, 15' side to nonresidential and 15'rear to residential. The NC property is wrapped on two sides by the school with one side facing the collector road and another to an open space. There are setbacks and buffer that would occur and it is limited to one story in height. In some ways the use that would go in there would be limited by their use and need for visibility.

Commissioner Cavenee asked if the neotraditional style product, with some homes being frontloaded and others back loaded, was prompting any request for a narrowing of the street width from the standard.

Planner Temes responded that Cooley Station has a streetscape and cross-sections that are approved as part of it and they are meeting the cross-sections as approved. Alleys within Cooley station are a minimum of 26 feet which is expanded from what alleys have been in the past, in Gilbert, so those cross-sections are already in place in the ordinance and staff is not asking to amend them in any way.

Commissioner Cavenee said that staff had mentioned that they are able to maintain, with the front yard setbacks, the 18'driveway length and he was having a difficult time understanding how that is accomplished when looking at the cross-section. On section GG, the 1<sup>st</sup> detail, from the property line they only have 6 feet to the sidewalk and if there is a 10 foot setback they are only getting 16 feet, not 18 feet.

Planner Temes said that the 18 foot is actually measured to the back of sidewalk so they would be able to take advantage of the 6 foot landscape as part of the measurement of the driveway.

Commissioner Cavenee said that some of the front yard setbacks are only 10 feet.

Planner Temes said that staff would clarify in the ordinance that that is to livable, not to garage face.

Commissioner Cavenee said that in those cases the minimum would be 12 feet.

Planner Temes said that she wanted to correct herself, and that it is a 20 foot minimum to the edge of sidewalk to garage face.

Vice Chairman Oehler said that his question was more aimed at the commercial niche. He noted that previous discussions with the school resulted with them saying they did not want that property. When the school came before the Planning Commission they redesigned it because they did not want that part of the property. Is there a Single Family designation for zoning that the school could have instead of NC or does it have to be moved to a commercial setting?

Planner Temes said that the next available residential category that would allow a school would be SF - 6 which would not be consistent with the SF - D next door. The NC seemed to be the best option.

Vice Chairman Oehler said that would be something that he would review in looking at that portion of the zoning. Maybe there is a better way for them to hash it out and make it work.

Planner Temes said that at this point in time she was not aware of there being a letter of intent but that she would definitely ask the applicant if there is one.

Chairman Wittmann asked if there was a reason why the applicant chose SF - D versus SF - 6 and greater based on the lot sizes that they are providing within the community.

Planner Temes stated that you get the 60% and 50% lot coverage when you have SF-D and she believed that they were going with a little more of a compact design where they could have detached garages, accessory structures and secondary dwelling units which are standard items that you see in a neotraditional neighborhood and having the increased lot coverage will allow for that flexibility as the neighborhood matures. Also because of much of the product being alley loaded they would have had to modify the side and rear setbacks again. Whatever way they would have decided to go, they probably would have ended up with the same modifications.

Chairman Wittmann said that she was thinking more of the reason for the base zoning being SF–D versus SF–6. She said that she could see an SF–D PAD along the entire property. She said that the reason that she thinks of that is because of the code amendments that they have entertained and reviewed recently and how certain changes were made and only permitted in the SF–6 and greater categories and SF–D is excluded. By doing so it may be excluded from some of the other benefits that the SF–6 categories receive. That is the reason that she was questioning why that particular category was chosen over the SF–6.

Planner Temes said that they went with SF - D as they were looking at doing as minor amendments as they could.

Chairman Wittmann said that she was having a little heartburn in regard to the 2 acre commercial piece and she knew that it was on a collector and was not highly visible but it seems as though it may not be the best use for that piece of property. She said she was afraid that they were carving out 2 ½ acres that may never developed. She said that she was concerned about future uses and the compatibility there.

Commissioner Sippel said that he would like to echo what the Vice Chairman and Chairman Wittmann had said as he did remember it coming before them previously and the school not wanting it for some reason. He said that he would like clarification from the applicant on that.

Z14-13 - Request for review and input to amend Ordinance Nos. 1916 and 2356 and rezone approximately 45 acres of real property within The Reserves at Val Vista Planned Area Development (PAD) and generally located south of the southeast corner of Val Vista Drive and Riggs Road, from approximately 45 acres of Single Family Residential - 35 (SF-35) zoning district with a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district to Single Family Residential - 10 (SF-10) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay zoning district.

Planner Nathan Williams stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone the 45 acre subject site to SF-10 PAD for a 90 lot residential subdivision. The site is located within the Santan Character Area and is Residential 1-2 dwelling units per acre land use designation. They are still compliant with the land use density. In 2007, the site along with the 32 acre site to the North, was part of a General Plan Amendment and rezone for Reserves at Val Vista and this site was designated SF - 15 PAD and had 65 lots. Planner Williams displayed an exhibit and noted that the 45 acres as well is the 32 acres was originally planned as one development. In 2012 the 45 acres was rezoned again to SF - 35 PAD specifically for a congregate living facility which included assisted living, memory care, hospice, skilled nursing and independent living. There were a total of 47 buildings. Planner Williams stated that this development plan is no longer feasible for the owners and they are requesting to rezone the 45 acres to SF – 10 PAD. The proposed development plan was displayed and it was noted that they are not requesting any deviations from the development standards so all the setbacks are the same. There are two main access points From Val Vista Drive and a 3rd access is proposed on the northeast corner of the site which will connect to the secondary 32 acres. The layout and design exhibits were shown and it was noted that there would be a subsequent preliminary plat. One of the benefits of the smaller 90 lots will be more open space and more flexibility and usable space. Approximately 20% open space is proposed

Commissioner Cavenee asked how far apart the two ingress points were off of Val Vista Drive.

Planner Williams said that he did not know the exact distance; however, it was based upon the standard separation requirements. He said that he would get a solid number.

Commissioner Cavenee asked if the other ingress point was being coordinated with the adjacent landowner to tie into.

Planner Williams said that was correct. The other property owner came in for a rezoning as well. They are not ready to come forward to a study session currently but the case is active. The connection is to tie into the 156 Street alignment and will keep circulation open. There is also a RW CD easement along the North property line.

Vice Chairman Oehler asked what the open space differential was between this design and the other one in terms of percentages.

Planner Williams said that the original plan was 14%.

Vice Chairman Oehler said that he preferred the current site. He asked how accessible the open space was behind lot 60 and 61.

Planner Williams said that piece could be accessed along the North.

Vice Chairman Oehler said that what he meant was how usable was the piece. He said that it could be a nice little pocket park for after a jog etc.

# Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda

No Changes were made.

# ADJOURN MEETING Study Session Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m. Chairman Jennifer Wittmann

Recorder Margo Fry

ATTEST: